



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

ESSAYS IN SCIENTIFIC SYNTHESIS. By *Eugenio Rignano*. Translated by *W. J. Greenstreet*. Pp. 254. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.; Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1918. Price 7s. 6d. net.

"The need that is making itself felt in science for unification and synthesis between the individual sciences is extending to all branches of civilization and even to civilization itself. Analysis, no doubt, is essential to the development of knowledge, but practised by itself it inevitably leads to the creation of water-tight compartments, unless subordinated to the final process of re-integration in the corpus of human knowledge." The world is ruled by ideas. We have already learned the futility of maintaining water-tight departments within certain branches of science. We are beginning to learn that the so-called "overlapping of frontiers" between certain branches of science is really a misnomer, for with the extension of knowledge we find that such frontiers exist merely as conventions which no longer have the excuse of being thought convenient. For instance, we read in the number of *Science Progress* from which the first two sentences of this notice are taken that the future progress of geology imperatively demands an amalgamation with the other sciences, or rather, perhaps, a recognition of the fact that the study of the earth includes in itself all the sciences. From cases like this, which may be multiplied, it is not far to the idea that there is a sufficient body of material common to all the sciences to justify the view that there is room for the advent of a new type of worker—the theorist pure and simple. As compared with the specialist in any department of science he will be in certain respects at a great disadvantage: but on the other hand he will be unhampered by much that prevents the specialist from shaking off the attitude of mind which is necessarily the outcome of a life of work spent in contact with the concrete.

M. Rignano's conception of a theorist whose width of reading and grasp of results achieved shall inspire him to creative effort in the detection of unsuspected analogies, in the framing of hypotheses, and in the opening up of wider horizons, is as attractive as it is suggestive. Perhaps in one direction he has been partly anticipated by the enterprise of Dr. George Sarton, whose efforts to place research in the history of science upon a proper footing have been so lamentably frustrated in Europe by recent events, but who, we are glad to say, is already reaping some measure of success in America. Dr. Sarton points out in a paper in *Scientia* on "The New Humanism" how a just appreciation of the signification of science, and of relative values, must be based on a knowledge of its history, and that at the same time that knowledge will serve to correct in the specialist the narrowness of outlook to which he is inevitably exposed from the very nature of his work, will confirm him in the disinterested course which he has adopted, and will go far to check every tendency either to empiricism or to prejudice.

It is natural that M. Rignano's suggestions should be exposed from the

first to the charge of being too vague to be worthy of consideration. This charge has been anticipated by our author, who in this series of essays sets forth in the first place his reasons for believing his views to be feasible and necessary, and again how the work of the theorist may be done in the fields of biology and other allied natural sciences with the same prospect of success as has attended the so-called "intrusion" of mathematics into the field of physics. The author has with conspicuous effect explained his position, and the skill with which he has handled his subject is as remarkable as what will seem to many the audacity and the novelty of his views. In France and in Italy he has had nothing to complain of in the warmth of their reception, and as he claims that he has, after all, merely followed the example of some of the most famous English writers of the past, he should at any rate be rewarded by a careful examination of proposals which seem to so many of us to be fraught with hope for the future of science and humanity. γ

THE NEW TESTAMENT. Translated from the Sinaitic Manuscript, discovered by Constantine Tischendorf at Mount Sinai. By H. T. Anderson. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Co., 1918.

By comparing this translation with the photograph of the Greek manuscript, the reader will discover two things:

1. Important matter omitted by the manuscript is added by the translator.
2. Important matter added by the manuscript is omitted by the translator.

Under No. 1 we refer especially to the Mark Appendix and the Adultery section in John. The Sinaitic manuscript ends Mark thus:

*They said nothing to any one, for they were afraid of.....
Gospel according to Mark.*

The English reader wants to see just how this venerable document looks in Greek. Consequently the addition of the second-century Appendix ("Mark" xvi. 9-20) falsifies this entirely. So, too, with the woman taken in adultery in John viii. The manuscript passes the story over in silence, but the translator inserts it with a note. The Bible Society does the same, both with Mark and John, in its edition of the Armenian Version, another of the ancient witnesses against these Gospel additions. Granville Penn, the grandson of William Penn, was the first to print Mark in English as it appears in the oldest sources, ending abruptly at xvi. 8 (London, 1836). That lay scholar rightly classed the familiar editorial addition as apocryphal.

Under No. 2, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas follow John's Revelation in the manuscript, without any note to indicate that they do not belong in the New Testament. This is just the kind of fact which the serious reader wants to know, but the translator withholds the knowledge. The New Testament, in the fourth century, was not yet sharply cut off from the Apostolic Fathers, not until 397.

The translator died many years ago and represented a now extinct school of theological shuffling. The Standard Publishing Company of Cincinnati has done very wrong to perpetuate this sort of thing. In science, public opinion has always required literary men to speak the truth. In the twentieth century it expects religion to do the same.

ALBERT J. EDMUNDS.